

Murray requires precisely zeroing the laser source 14a and laser target 14b. Then, at the end of the thermal cycle of the equipment to be measured, the laser equipment is re-zeroed and the resulting displacement measured. The Murray method cannot reasonably be considered to teach a method comprising steps of attaching a first adapter on a non-adjusting component, placing a first line generator laser holder on the first adapter to produce a first visible line, attaching a second adapter on an adjusting component, and placing a second line generator laser holder on a second adapter for producing a second visible line, wherein the visible lines determine an angle of azimuth of the components, as is positively recited in at least independent claim 1. Nor does Murray teach the further steps as positively recited in dependent claims 2-10. Murray does not measure an azimuth between separately generated lines.

The Office Action further states that "since the device computes angles, it may be considered to be a 'digital protractor'". This is an unreasonable interpretation of the positively recited structure term "a digital protractor" recited in the pending claims. The digital protractor is a device placed in a first position and a second position. Murray discloses no such device.

The Office Action asserts that the method disclosed in Murray inherently results in, among other things, the shafts having the same roll as is claimed in the present subject matter. This conclusion is unreasonable on its face in that cylindrical shafts without cross-sectional or other distinguishing alignment features cannot be "aligned" in any meaningful sense in the roll direction. Further, even if the shafts in Murray had such a distinguishing characteristic, such as a longitudinal channel, nothing in the method disclosed in Murray suggests any need or mechanism for aligning the shafts in roll.

Finally, the Office Action concedes that Murray does not teach "adapters with slots and grooves specifically as claimed." As such, the Examiner relies on the assertion that


modifying Murray in such a way as to include those features would be obvious, since they are merely "alternative mating surfaces". This assertion is wrong. The significance of the slots and grooves is more than providing a mating surface. As positively recited in at least claims 11 and 14, the distinguishing characteristics are that the grooves are perpendicular, thus allowing the digital protractor to precisely determine both the roll and elevation of the non-adjusting and adjusting components. Murray does not teach, nor can it reasonably be considered to have suggested, modifying the mounts to accommodate perpendicular grooves.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of at least the features recited in independent claim 1 is neither taught nor would it have been suggested by Murray. Further, independent claim 11 is also neither taught nor would it have been reasonably suggested by Murray for at least its inclusion of several of the same distinguishing features as are recited in independent claim 1 as discussed above. Finally, claims 2-10 and 12-14 are also neither taught, nor would they have been reasonably suggested, by Murray for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on independent claims 1 and 11, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

For at least the above reasons, the combinations of all of the features varyingly recited in claims 1-14 cannot be considered to be taught, or to have been reasonably suggested by, Murray. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Pardini
Registration No. 30,411

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

TJP:DAT/tls

Date: July 21, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--